

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant reiterates the arguments which have been already submitted and respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited art. Nevertheless, solely in order to expedite prosecution, independent claim 11 has been amended to further clarify that the calculation expression can be defined based on at least one field of data used in a plurality of records stored in said database, thereby allowing access to various fields of data stored in said plurality of records to be selectively controlled (see, for example, figures 7, 8 and 10 of the present invention, for an exemplary method for defining a formula, and using it to control access to records based on a field of data in the database). In other words, a calculation expression can be evaluated for a plurality of records in the database. In addition, it is possible to use the calculation expression to selectively control access to various fields in said records. It is earnestly believed that it is clear that the "Granted Permissions Table" of *Bapat et al.* which is the basis for the Examiner's rejection does Not teach or even remotely suggest any of these features. Thus, the claimed invention is patentable over the cited art for these reasons. Nevertheless, the Examiner's rejections are again fully traversed below for at least the following reasons:

(a) *Bapat et al.* does NOT teach a calculation expression, for controlling access to a database, that can be evaluated based on a state variable of a database

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action page 10), it is very respectfully submitted that *Bapat et al.* does NOT teach a calculation expression, for controlling access to a database, that can be evaluated based on a on a state variable of a database. As noted in noted, for example, in the summary of the invention, the expression can be based on fields of the records as well as other information, for example, various state variables of the database (e.g., date, time, number of records, etc.)

(b) Bapat et al. does NOT teach a calculation expression, for controlling access to a database, that can be evaluated based on a field of a record in the database

As noted by the Examiner, "FDN is a name for a managed object." (Office Action, page 8, citing col. 26, lines 28-33 of *Bapat et al.*). It is also noted that the "FDN operates as the primary key to data stored in a table (Office Action, page 8, citing col. 19, lines 36-40 of *Bapat et al.*). However, It is respectfully submitted that FDN is the name assigned to an object, and it is NOT a field of actual data in a record stored in a database.

(c) Bapat et al. does NOT teach a calculation expression for controlling access to a database which can be evaluated to determine access

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action, page 5), it is very respectfully submitted that each row in the Granted Permissions Table of *Bapat et al.* is NOT a mathematical process that is evaluated by the FDN. *Bapat et al.* merely teaches a Granted Permissions Table that is used to store information, and which can be subsequently searched based on the FDN.

(d) Bapat et al. and Elmasri taken alone, or properly combined do NOT teach or suggest defining a calculation expression for a password

Per MPEP §2143.01, in order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must a motivation or suggestion in the combination of references. In the Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that it would have been obvious to use a password for a user. However, it is respectfully submitted that this assertion does NOT address the lack of teaching in both *Bapat et al.* and *Elmasri* with respect to a motivation or suggestion to define a calculation expression for a password which is associated with one or more users. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation or suggestion in *Bapat et al.* or *Elmasri* for defining a calculation expression for a password

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the rejections to the claims.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300